

NOTE

"ENDELLITE" WILL REDUCE AMBIGUITY AND CONFUSION IN NOMENCLATURE OF "HALLOYSITE"

(Received 20 February 1976)

Two papers in the November, 1975, issue of this Journal amply and clearly reiterate the ambiguity and confusion in the nomenclature of halloysite (Churchmann and Carr, 1975; Brindley and Pedro, 1975). The solution to the problem is essentially and clearly self-evident in the statement by Brindley and Pedro, "it was unanimously agreed that endellite is seldom used, and that halloysite is ambiguous".

The solution: use endellite for the $4\text{H}_2\text{O}$ variety of kaolin mineral. It is not at all ambiguous, and has never meant anything else. It was duly proposed in accordance with official nomenclatural rules in 1943 by Alexander, Faust and Hendricks, all very competent mineralogists. In 1955 it was again, reviewed and rejustified, if any justification was needed, by Faust. His paper was critically reviewed by Fleischer, Ross, Schaller, Hendricks, Frondel and Kulp in addition to the regular editorial screening by the American Mineralogist. Could approval (or disapproval) be amassed by any more experience, eminence, and prestige in nomenclature of mineralogy than was represented by such a group?

Why did the name, "endellite" with so much to recommend it, both scientifically and utilitarian, meet with disfavor and receive scant use? One heard rumors back in the time of World War II and its aftermath that emotional feelings generated from non-mineralogic and non-scientific causes prevailed to depopularize it. If such rumor should be true, surely more than 3 decades later the clay mineralogical community can bring itself to recognize the name and to use a most useful mineral name that was proposed in all propriety.

It would be redundant for us to repeat the cogent, correct, and precise arguments for endellite presented in

Faust's 1955 paper: let each reader re-examine it himself. Teachers of clay mineralogy are frustrated and embarrassed scientifically by the time and effort needed to explain to students the nomenclatural mess endured by clay mineralogists that will be cleared up by the use of endellite.

We propose and encourage that the Clay Minerals Society take a lead in implementing what Faust (1955) clearly stated in his summary: "The acceptance of the name endellite for the mineral with $4\text{H}_2\text{O}$ will obviate ambiguity and leave no doubt about the identity of the mineral under consideration (as the proposal of MacEwan does not do)."

University of
Missouri-Columbia,
U.S.A.

W. D. KELLER
WM. D. JOHNS

REFERENCES

- Alexander, L. T., Faust, G. T. and Hendricks, S. B. (1943) Relationship of the clay minerals halloysite and endellite: *Am. Miner.* **28**, 1-18.
- Brindley, G. W. and Pedro, G. (1975) Meeting of the Nomenclature Committee of A.I.P.E.A.: *Clays & Clay Minerals* **23**, 413-414.
- Churchmann, B. J. and Carr, R. M. (1975) The definition and nomenclature of halloysites: *Clays & Clay Minerals* **23**, 382-388.
- Faust, G. T. (1955) The endellite-halloysite nomenclature: *Am. Miner.* **40**, 1110-1118.